

## **August 5, 2004 Revised WSTL Advisory Committee Minutes**

Meeting Minutes will be approved on August 12, 2004

Community members present: Diane Conradi, Laurie Gaiser, Jack Waller, Pat Sullivan, Gayle and Dan Weinburg, Camden Eastwood, Christine Hensleigh, Dud and Jo Mahler, 5 additional community members arrived later.

Committee members present: Greg Gunderson, Jeff Gilman, Steve Lorch, Sandy Gibson, Marty Zeller, Marshall Friedman, Lisa Horowitz, Richard Marriott, Leesa Valentino, Tyler Tourville, Rob Hedstrom, Alan Elm, Charlie Abell, Sheila Bowen, Andy Feury, Donna Maddux

Marty started the meeting by recapping his role. His goal is to capture the best interest of groups involved, community and the DNRC. We need to be able to explore all possibilities. We need to have open dialog on such words as development, density, and conservation easement. We are trying to find ways to use different tools.

Reviewed the planning memo section by section:

### **Happy Valley**

Discussion following community preference outlined. Leesa is concerned that we don't have in the plan to keep it from being developed. Marty suggested conservation easements and moving development around so it was on higher ground if it fits into the septic plan to supply finances. Marshall offered that the no development be done. Suggested lands be kept in the traditional use and not transfer title, it stays in the ownership of the trust. Marty asked if the septic is solved would we have the same feeling? Many committee members agree to keep it the same. Marty answered the question regarding conservation easement stating the Nature Conservatory can hold parks. There are ways of securing easements. Purchase of the easement would give a deed restriction and the DNRC would keep the title. May allow a certain number of activities and that would affect the financial relationship. Charlie asked if there is a figure? Marty stated for planning purposes it would reduce the value of the property about 50%. The type of conservation easement we are looking for development would make it reduce about 70%. Charlie feels it could be about \$50 M and he does not believe our community has that type of money. Marty asked if we believed a group would want to come together for the privacy, etc.?

***Marshall moved the Happy Valley area be removed from development, the land be retained by the trust and there be no transfer of title. Jeff second.***

Marty feels we have to do this in context to the desires of the community and to the financial requirements. He stressed the mandate is to generate fair return and look at what the community needs. A strategy has to be looked at that does not include development because of the septic situation; however, if someone comes along and fixes the problem there should be no reason not to develop and produce revenue for the trust. Jeff stated that when we started this process we were on the path of a development plan.

He wants to put forth a community plan not a DNRC plan. He wants to spend time to create revenue besides development. Charlie asked if the motion would permit logging? Marshall stated it is a traditional use, therefore, yes. Charlie agrees there is economic

plan outside of development that can be used. Lands across from the view most valuable because it is not develop. Lands left in a natural state will be valuable and give more tax revenue. Marty stated it does not fit mandate of the trust. Need more revenue.

Committee discussed if the mandates says a development plan. Rob talked about issue of development because of septic problem. He question fixing the problem for the DNRC so it can be developed. Who will pick up the cost of the septic? Lisa is picking up from the group that development should not be anywhere. What type of revenue besides timber? Alan stated the community could not attain the DNRC value if they are using the bar as a residential sale.

Marshall suggests a task force needs to be set up to look at additional revenue. He feels the mandate is saying one thing, which is different from Marty is stating. Marty reviewed the principles we are basing this process on. If we have disrespect for the DNRC goals then we are not buying into the principles. We are in trouble if we do not agree to the principles. Steve feels we all agreed on the principles and should work towards following them.

Called for the question. 10 voted yes and 3 in opposition. Motion passed.

Lisa stated she is in opposition because it does not have any revenue source attached.

Review of the Community Preference of each area (see planning document)

Comments:

Donna asked about the entrance to the Plum Creek parcel. Jeff believes it is Lupfer road. Jeff asked about DNRC position on “density transfer”. Lisa said it is a tool we should be using.

## **KM**

Rich has taken the draft plan this to the neighbors. They don’t want additional development but agree the two 40 acres defined on the map could be developed. Isolated land to the North is leased and they just renewed.

***Rich moves that we remove all property for development except the two forty west of KM and south Spring Prairie. The lands will be retained by the trust. Rob seconded.***

Steve asked if it would mean shifting the density? Rich confirmed we could move it as much as possible. Marty asked for clarification of why lease instead of outright purchase. Charlie stated our lands keeping going up and we can have our cake and eat it to with consideration we can depreciate the lands yearly. Steve mentioned that leases affect the state’s marketability.

Called for the question. 11 voted yes and 3 in opposition. Motion passed.

## **Swift Creek**

Lisa stated she believes we have to stay the course and not amend our plan.

***Marshall moved to remove any development, lands to remain in tradition use and lands remain with trust. Richard seconded***

Need clarification of campground use.

Lisa stated she only is opposing because revenue needs to be part of the motion. Alan and Andy clarified with the maker of the motion if removes conservation easement or development. Marshall clarified conservation easement is acceptable. Donna asked the maker of motion if it precludes campground fee use? Marshall stated that it would fall under traditional use and Jeff stated we collect fee now for campground use. Marty believes the landowners would be highly motivated to reduce the use of that land and compensate the trust to do so.

Greg wants to see alternative forms of revenue that do not involve commercial or residential use. Water dangers and wildlife need to be a consideration. Nature conservatory has brought conservation to the table in other communities. This is a form of alternative revenue.

Marty stated the plan should predict the future. He is concerned we are not addressing the predictability. If sale of development rights allows the landowners at the end of the lake to end up with one or 2 homes is that too much? Charlie stated we cannot look at that land in isolation. Plum Creek owns land above the area we are looking and they are selling lands so it seems obvious that Plum Creek will sell that land.

Called for the question. 13 voted yes and 1 in opposition. Motion passed.

### **Spencer Lake**

Marty discussed financial scenarios of the Spencer area. Based on assumptions Marty stated 300 acres could be added to reach density and bring in revenue. Andy stated Marty might be making the assumption of planning which includes density, which in all actuality all the density needed for the full 13,000 acres could happen in the designated area of Spencer we set aside for development. Andy would not be comfortable adding acres. Argument can be made that the trust does not have to realize a value of \$15M but they have to realize revenue from traditional uses. Marty asked what happens when the gun club goes away and the answer is tradition use.

***Jeff moved to allow development on three of the isolated designated pieces, maintain the rest for traditional uses and explore other revenue options and the lands remain under the trust. Three isolated pieces are the 200-acre piece, the 40-acre piece to the west and the piece north of 93. Lisa second.***

Lisa feels Spencer is important and there is room to develop. Donna sees some good cluster development such as townhouses and some planned room development.

Richard asked for clarification of land in the motion. Jeff clarified lease is not part of the motion, however it is a recommendation.

Steve asked if easement needed since development would be almost impossible in some areas. Rob talked about the rifle club's long-term plans which included looking at safety. They pay \$1,700 a year for lease. Donna asks if the motion preclude fencing and getting a fee. There is a fee now and it would fall in traditional uses.

Discuss on transfer rights, DNRC revenue and legal protection of Spencer for the future. . Called for the question. 8 voted yes and 5 in opposition. Motion passed.

### **Beaver Lake and Skyles Lake**

Tyler concerned with the lower edge being developed. Murray Lake is well used. Development there would stop connection and Greg spoke to the same concern. Tyler is concerned with any homes. Marty asked if we want permanent protection or lease.

Tyler moved for removal all development and the lands are retained by the trust. Discussion of the lodge on Murray Lake took place. Marshall asked for an amendment to the motion. Marshall moved that state retain ownership and development removed from Beaver Lake/Skyles Lake area. No residential development and retain community access for a lodge on the Murray lake and only on a lease bases. Neither received a second. Motion failed.

Back Country Lodge is still on the plan. Greg feels we need to maintain the island pieces. Can the city lease it from the State to get our community back to these areas? Alan talked to Tyler motion about saving this area.

***Marshall moved there would be no residential development in the Beaver Lake/Skyles Lake area except for traditional cabin leases and the rest of the lands remain in traditional uses and it continues to be owned by the trust. Charlie second.***

The lodge is not part of the motion; however, the option is available for the team that looks at additional revues to bring it back to the table.

Called for the question. 9 voted yes and 3 in opposition. Motion passed.

**Next meetings agenda August 12, 6 PM, no conference call**

Plan for revenue generating idea

Community capacity manage plans of open space

Meeting Adjourned 8:00 PM